

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES

FILED

08 AUG 19 PM 3:13

*This space for
CLERK, U.S. District Court
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA*

TO: ☐ U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE / ☐ U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE Miller *cyw*
FROM: K. Hammerly, Deputy Clerk RECEIVED DATE: 8/18/2008 *DEPUTY*
CASE NO.: 08cv1394 DOCUMENT FILED BY: Plaintiff Limpin
CASE TITLE: Limpin v. Astrue
DOCUMENT ENTITLED: Motion for Court Certification and Motion for appointment of Counsel;
Motion to Supplement Complaint; POS

Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Rule	Discrepancy
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.4	Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1	Missing table of contents
<input type="checkbox"/> 15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
<input type="checkbox"/> 30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Supplemental documents require court order
<input type="checkbox"/>	Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	OTHER: - No proof of service - No identified hearing date. L.R. 7.1(b)

Date forwarded: 8/18/2008

ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- ☐ The document is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.
- ☒ The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties.

Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate? ☒ Yes. *cyw* Court Copy retained by chambers ☐

Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83.1

CHAMBERS OF: JEFFREY T. MILLER

Dated: _____

By: *[Signature]*

REJECTED

KARL T. LIMPIN
3710 Wabash Avenue, Apt. #314, San Diego, CA 92104-3970
Social Security Number: 617-38-6706
Phone Number: (619) 729-4565

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

KARL T. LIMPIN, on behalf of himself
and all others similarly situated

Plaintiffs,

v.

MICHAEL J. ASTRUE, Commissioner of
the Social Security Administration

Defendant

CASE NO. 08cv1394 JM (RBB)

**MOTION FOR COURT CERTIFICATION
ORDER OF CLASS ACTION**

28 U.S.C. §1332

AND

**MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF
COUNSEL SUBSEQUENT TO
CERTIFICATION OF CLASS ACTION**

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(g)(1)

Plaintiff LIMPIN, hereby respectfully resubmits a motion for certification order of a class action for all California Aged, Blind and Disabled citizens versus defendant, Mr. Michael J. Astrue, Commissioner of the Social Security Administration pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1332(a)(1), and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure ("FRCP") 23(c)(1)(A).

Inter alia, plaintiff LIMPIN alleges that the Chambers of the Honorable ("Hon.") Jeffrey T. Miller "inadvertently" misconstrued plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel and certification order dated July 31, 2008 for class action based on another motion for In Forma Pauperis under 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(1)